

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 were originally filed. Claims 1-7 are rejected in the Office Action, Claim 8 is added in this Amendment. Claims 1-8 are pending.

In the Office Action the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). Appropriate corrections are shown on the replacement drawings enclosed herewith. Specifically, reference number 30 was changed to 28 with reference to the interface.

In the Office Action the drawings were further objected to a failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because certain reference characters were not mentioned in the specification. The specification was amended to add the appropriate references to the existing description.

In the Office Action claims 1-4 were objected to because the term "translator" is deemed to be non-statutory. While Applicants respectfully submit that terminology employed to describe the apparatus is clearly within the discretion of the inventors<sup>1</sup> and that "translator" is used consistently throughout the application to describe a device or apparatus, out of an abundance of caution, claims 1-4 have been amended in accordance with the request of the Examiner. Applicants submit that this amendment does not change the scope of claims 1-4.

In the Office Action claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In claim element (m)(x) and extra (m) was inadvertently inserted, the method should instead have returned to step (d). Appropriate correction is included in this amendment.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Intellicall, Inc. v. Phonometrics, Inc.*, 952 F.2d 1384, 1388, 21 USPQ.2d 1383, 1386 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In the Office Action claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,862,354 to Curiger, et al. Claim 1 is distinct from Curiger, et al. because claim 1 requires a data direction switch for directing the flow of data *between* said primary one-wire bus and said secondary one-wire bus (emphasis added). No such feature is disclosed by Curiger, et al. The Office Action cites several statements in Curiger, et al. which deal with control of the direction of data flow on each of the one-wire buses of Curiger, et al. but none of the quotes deal with directing data flow between separate one-wire buses. Claim 1 requires that the data direction switch directs the flow of data to and from the primary one-wire bus onto, or off of, the secondary one-wire bus. This is simply not disclosed in Curiger, et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and, at least for the reasons stated with regard to claim 1, are likewise in condition for allowance. Reexamination and allowance of claims 1-4 are respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 5, this claim includes a third operational mode wherein serial data is not transmitted between the master and the slave. The quote from Curiger, et al. Cited in the Office Action simply refers to a condition where the master is writing a logic 0 to the slave. It should be noted that communication of serial data is still taking place between the master of Curiger, et al. and a slave device, it is the communication of a logic zero as opposed to the communication of a logic one.

Claim 5 has been amended to clarify that the third operational mode of claim 5 applies to the situation where the master attempts communication with the slave but the communication is

interrupted by the translator. There is no disclosure in Curiger, et al. of similar operation.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is thus in condition for allowance. Reexamination and allowance of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,072 B2 to Little, et al. With regard to claim 6, the first step of claim 6 requires: providing a translator having a primary one-wire bus in electrical communication with the master and a secondary one-wire bus in electrical communication with the slave device, said translator providing interruptible communication between the master and the slave device. The disclosure of Little, et al. does not provide primary and secondary one-wire buses. The Office Action cites the external emulation bus of Little, et al. This bus is not a one-wire bus, in fact in Fig. 1, ref. 20, the emulation bus is 8 bits wide with 13 control lines. Thus, there is no disclosure in Little, et al. of providing a translator inserted between a master device on a first one-wire bus and a slave on a second one-wire bus to allow interruptible communication between the master and the slave.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 6 are respectfully requested.

In a similar manner, the first two steps of claim 7 require providing primary and secondary one-wire buses. Little, et al. do not disclose multiple one-wire buses, especially with any provision for communication therebetween (as provided in steps (l) and (m)).

Application No. 09/825,098  
Amendment Dated 9/27/04  
Reply to Office Action of 06/25/04  
Page 13 of 13

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is thus in condition for allowance.  
Reexamination and allowance of claim 7 are respectfully requested.

\* \* \* \* \*

This paper is intended to constitute a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.  
Please contact the undersigned if it appears that a portion of this response is missing or if there remain any additional matters to resolve. If the Examiner feels that processing of the application can be expedited in any respect by a personal conference, please consider this an invitation to contact the undersigned by phone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/27/2004

Fred H. Holmes  
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No.: 43,677

Fred H. Holmes  
(type or print name of practitioner)

Tel. No.: (918) 599-0621

321 S. Boston Ave., Suite 800  
P.O. Address

Customer No.: 22206

Tulsa, OK 74103-3318